



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,586	03/14/2002	Steve R. Krajewski	020375-005400US	3244
20350	7590	06/15/2007	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			CHANDLER, SARA M	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER				
EIGHTH FLOOR				
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/098,586	KRAJEWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sara Chandler	3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/09/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-7 and 18-23 in the reply filed on 03/21/07 is acknowledged.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

There is not a Oath or Declaration on record.

Claim Interpretation

1. In determining patentability of an invention over the prior art, all claim limitations have been considered and interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. See MPEP § 2111.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Pruter*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969). See MPEP § 2111.

2. All claim limitations have been considered. Additionally, all words in the claims have been considered in judging the patentability of the claims against the

Art Unit: 3693

prior art. The following language is interpreted as not further limiting the scope of the claimed invention. See MPEP 2106 II C.

Language in a method claim that states only the intended use or intended result (e.g., "for _____"), but the expression does not result in a manipulative difference in the steps of the claim. Language in a system claim that states only the intended use or intended result (e.g., "for _____"), but does not result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. In other words, if the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as "*if, may, might, can could*", as optional language. As matter of linguistic precision, optional claim elements do not narrow claim limitations, since they can always be omitted.

Claim limitations that contain statement(s) such as "*wherein, whereby*", that fail to further define the steps or acts to be performed in method claims or the discrete physical structure required of system claims.

USPTO personnel should begin claim analysis by identifying and evaluating each claim limitation. For processes, the claim limitations will define steps or acts to be performed. For products, the claim limitations will define discrete physical structures or materials. Product claims are claims that are directed to either machines, manufactures or compositions of matter. See MPEP § 2106 II C.

The subject matter of a properly construed claim is defined by the terms that limit its scope. It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of

Art Unit: 3693

language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim:

- (A) statements of intended use or field of use,
- (B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses,
- (C) "wherein" clauses, or
- (D) "whereby" clauses.

See MPEP § 2106 II C.

3. Independent claims are examined together, since they are not patentable distinct. If applicant expressly states on the record that two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in a single application, the Examiner may require the applicant to elect an invention to which the claims will be restricted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Erickson, US Pub. No. 2002/0123969.

Re Claims 1-7: Erickson discloses a method for using a decision engine to adjust parameter values of a financial account (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9; [0001] – [0063]), the method comprising:
assigning to the financial account an account processing method that sets one or

more parameter values of the financial account, the account processing method having an associated method override that modifies at least one of the one or more parameter values set by the account processing method (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9, [0002] [0003] [0006] [0012] [0027] [0031] [0032] [0034] [0046] [0047] [0048] [0062]); providing to the decision engine a set of decision criteria comprising a set of decision elements each having one or more threshold values associated therewith, the set of decision elements corresponding to account attributes of the financial account (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9, [0003] – [0012]; [0031] – [0058]); providing to the decision engine the corresponding account attributes of the financial account (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9, [0003] – [0012]; [0030] – [0034]; [0046] – [0061]); obtaining from the decision engine a result indicating whether to apply the associated method override to the financial account, wherein the decision engine determines the result by applying the decision criteria to the account attributes (Erickson, abstract; Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9, [0001] [0002] [0007] – [0012]; [0027] – [0035]; [0046] [0047]; [0053] – [0057]; [0062]); and applying the associated method override to the financial account in response to a result indicating that the associated method override is to be applied (Erickson, abstract; Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9, [0001] [0002] [0007] – [0012]; [0027] – [0035]; [0046] [0047]; [0053] – [0057]; [0062]).

Re Claims 18-21: Erickson discloses a system for adjusting a processing parameter of a financial account (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9; [0001] – [0006]), comprising:

a first data store for storing financial account data for the financial account, the financial account data including account processing methods and associated method overrides applied to the financial account, the financial account data further including account history information (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9; [0001] – [0063]);

a second data store for storing decision rules for determining whether to apply a method override to the financial account based on the account history

information (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9; [0001] – [0063]); and

a decision engine configured to communicate with the first data store and the second data store, the decision engine configured to retrieve the decision rules from the second data store and the account history information from the first data store, to determine based on the decision rules and the account history information whether a method override should be applied to the financial account, and to apply the method override to the financial account (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9; [0001] – [0063]).

Re Claim 22: Erickson discloses the claimed system *supra* and further discloses a system comprising a user interface configured to communicate with the first data store, wherein the user interface is configured to provide financial account data including whether a method override is applied to the financial account (Erickson, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9; [0029] – [0034]).

Art Unit: 3693

Re Claim 23: Ericksen discloses the claimed system *supra* and further discloses a system comprising: a conflict checking module configured to detect a combination of account processing methods and associated method overrides that creates a conflict when applied to a financial account and to issue a warning when the combination is detected (Ericksen, abstract, Figs. 1-8, Tables 1-9; [0001] – [0063]).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following US Pat. Pub. and US Pat. No's are related to adjusting financial accounts:

("20020069122"|"20020152116"|"20030101131"|"5970478"|"6374230"|"7092905").PN.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara Chandler whose telephone number is 571-272-1186. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMC


JAGDISH N. PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER